

our districts and honor our veterans because of their commitment to our country and our freedoms.

I am here tonight to talk about an amazing announcement today that literally made the headlines on newspapers all over the country.

What do the American people mostly Democrats and also a significant amount of Republican Members know that the Republican leadership does not seem to know? Well, that is an open-ended question and it may take more than my 5 minutes to answer, but I will do it as best I can.

We want doctors and patients, and not HMO bureaucrats, to make the medical decisions. Today one of the Nation's largest HMOs, United Health Group, took the first step in recognizing the error of their ways. They decided they would no longer review each treatment recommendation made by a physician.

With the active support of the American people and the HMO reform conference committee, hopefully this will just be the first company that will do that and will proceed to have some real true HMO reform.

One company in the insurance business recognized what Democrats and the American people have known for years is that the most qualified people to make medical treatment decisions are the patients and doctors who know the details of that specific case.

Before we claim victory, we have to recognize that this is only a first step and in some ways a very small step.

Instead of reviewing the cases as they come in, the United Health Care has decided to review their physicians once a year. This is much better, but it still raises some concerns. One of the problems can be, that in reviewing a doctor's treatment decisions in this manner, it may be nearly impossible to determine the case each doctor has and whether there is specific reason such as treating a high-risk patient or children that led the doctor to prescribe more tests than another doctor.

Again, this is a first step and a good step, but we still have got a long way to go. Other HMOs need to follow United's lead and every HMO, including United, needs to commit to leaving medical treatment decisions to the doctors and the patients without interference.

This recent decision by United raises the broader question of HMO reform and whether it is still necessary if other HMOs follow United's lead. The short answer is yes. The truth is that most HMOs are good. Managed care is created to take the ever increasing cost out of health care. But what we have seen is that not only have they taken the cost out up until this year, but they have also taken the quality out.

According to United, they approved 99 percent of the claims that their doc-

tors had recommended. So what they found out is that they created a bureaucracy that they were paying for, that they approved those claims.

What is so important is that the patients' bill of rights that this House passed on a very bipartisan vote is still needed to protect the population who find themselves in an HMO that may not be as responsive as United is or as realistic as United that actually looked at it and said, hey, it is not cost effective to continue to do this.

□ 2200

As long as the industry continues to operate in their unregulated vacuum, these nonresponsive HMOs will continue to pop up and take advantage of the unsuspecting consumers. The scariest part of this scenario is that these unsuspecting consumers will not know that they are in such an HMO until it is too late. There are a lot of laws in this country that are designed to protect the majority from a small percentage of offenders. Most of us would not think of taking money from a person in return for a service but then when they come to collect what they paid for, deny, or worse in some cases, even delay that service. But the HMOs accept the premiums from consumers, but then deny or delay benefits in the hope that the consumer, who is really now the patient, will just give up and go away. They need to be held accountable for these deplorable actions.

I have an example of a constituent in my district. If you are familiar with Houston, she lives in the north part of Harris County. She had an appointment with a specialist in her neighborhood near Intercontinental Airport in the Humble area twice and it was canceled by her HMO. Finally they assigned her to a specialist across town. She said it was just difficult for her to be able to have family take her across town when literally there was a hospital complex that was so close she could get to. Again, it was delayed twice and ultimately could be denied because of transferring her to a specialist across town.

No other industry enjoys the protection that the HMO industry does from Federal law under the ERISA act. With this shield they are able to ignore the needs of their patients and they are held accountable to nobody. What I hope we would do as a Congress would be to respond and hopefully the HMO conference committee that we have will be responsive, Mr. Speaker.

#### TIME FOR CONGRESS TO CLARIFY SCOPE OF EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, there has been increasing controversy over

executive orders and presidential proclamations since President Franklin Roosevelt's administration. The recent comments of President Clinton's aide, John Podesta, in U.S. News and World Report, give us even more reason to be concerned. Mr. Podesta, in a moment of explicit candor, outlines the President's plan to issue a whole series of executive orders and changes to Federal rules without consulting Congress.

Mr. Podesta goes further, saying, "There is a pretty wide sweep of things we're looking to do and we're going to be very aggressive in pursuing it." That is the Podesta Plan.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to issue a dire warning. There is a "culture of deference" in this Congress, and if we do not address this issue of executive lawmaking, it is a violation of our own oath of office. I am most deeply concerned about the Podesta Plan, to use executive orders and other presidential directives to implement the President's agenda without the consent of Congress. Executive lawmaking is a violation of the Constitution. Article I states that all legislative powers shall be vested in the Congress.

Sadly, Congress should not be surprised that this President's frustrated staff is trying to bypass Congress. We have seen this before. When the President issued his executive order on striker replacements, he attempted to do what had been denied him by the legal legislative process. The same was true when the President issued his proclamation establishing a national monument in Utah, a sovereign State.

Mr. Speaker, the framers expected national policy to be the result of open and full debate, hammered out by the legislative and executive branches. They believed in careful deliberation, conducted in a representative assembly, subject to all the checks and balances that characterize our constitutional system. Having broken with England in 1776, the founders rejected government by monarchy and one-man rule. Nowhere in the Constitution is the President specifically given the authority to issue these directives.

In the legislative veto decision of 1983, *INS v. Chadha*, the Supreme Court insisted that congressional power be exercised "in accord with a single, finely wrought and exhaustively considered, procedure." The Court said that the records of the Philadelphia Convention and the State ratification debates provide "unmistakable expression of a determination that legislation by the national Congress be a step-by-step, deliberate and deliberative process."

If Congress is required to follow this rigorous process, how absurd it is to argue that a President can accomplish the same result by unilaterally issuing an executive order. Of course he cannot. The President's controversial use of presidential directives skirt the constitutional process, offend the values

announced by the Court in the legislative veto case, and do serious damage to our commitment to representative government and the rule of law.

It is time to clarify the scope of executive authority vested in the presidency by article II of the Constitution. The Supreme Court has failed to address this issue and it is time for Congress to invoke the powerful weapons at its command. Through its ability to authorize programs and appropriate funds, Congress must now define and limit presidential power.

This is the danger: The road to tyranny does not begin by egregious usurpations, but by those which appear logical; meant to gain public support. We must not be lulled into complacency, because later they will be aimed directly at our fundamental liberties and at our representative self-government.

My colleagues, eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

#### URBAN SPRAWL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the current politically-correct, fad issue with the liberal elite is what is called urban sprawl. Those who are shouting the loudest about this are for the most part people who are very anti-private property or at least people who are very lukewarm about property rights. They are usually wealthy environmental extremists, and ironically they are the very people who are the most responsible for urban sprawl in the first place.

Today, the Federal Government owns about 30 percent of the land in this Nation. State and local governments and quasi-governmental units own another 20 percent, so that almost half the land is in some type of public ownership. The most disturbing things, however, are, number one, the very rapid rate in which government has been taking over private property in the last 30 or 40 years; and, number two, the governmental restrictions being placed on the land that remains in private ownership now.

I attended a homebuilders meeting a few years ago in which they estimated that 60 percent of the developable land in this country would be off-limits with strict enforcement of our wetlands laws. Also, the Endangered Species Act has stopped or delayed for years the development of roads that would have saved many lives and has stopped construction and driven up costs of many homes. And there is something called the Wildlands Projects which the Washington Post said is a plan by environmentalists to place under public ownership half the land that remains as private property today.

I know that to many people, the word "development" has become almost a dirty word. But home ownership has always been a very important part of the American dream. Are those of us who have homes now going to say to young couples and young families, "Well, we have ours but we don't want you to have yours"? Are we going to tell young people in small homes now that they cannot someday move to a bigger home because we basically have to stop all development? Are we going to tell homebuilders and construction workers that they are going to have to find some other work, probably at much lower pay?

No one wants our beautiful countryside turned into strip malls or parking lots, but development can be done in beautiful, environmentally sound ways. Old, unsightly buildings or blighted areas can be greatly improved. We should stop the local government appetite for farms which they then turn into industrial parks and give land at bargain-basement rates, sometimes to foreign corporations.

Why do I say environmentalists have caused a great deal of urban sprawl, indeed most of it? Well, just think about it. When more and more land is taken over by government or restricted from development, that forces more and more people on to smaller and smaller pieces of land. It also drives up the price of the remaining developable land, which also forces more people into apartments, townhouses or houses on postage-stamp-size lots.

Big government, brought on primarily by our liberal elite, has also caused urban sprawl. Big government has given most of its contracts, favorable regulatory rulings, and tax breaks to extremely big business. This has driven many small businesses and small farms out of existence.

Now the environmental extremists are aiming at agricultural run-off or spill-off. Rigid Federal rules and red tape hit the small farmers hardest and keep driving them out, which of course inures to the benefit of the big corporate farms. When the Federal Government drives small businesses and small farms and even small hospitals out of existence, it drives more and more people into the cities and causes more and more urban sprawl.

We need to remember that private property is one of the main things that has given us the great freedom and prosperity that we enjoy in this country today. It is one of the main things that sets us apart from nations like the former Soviet Union and other starvation-existence type countries.

Tom Bethell in his new book, "The Noblest Triumph," says, "Private property both disperses power and shields us from the coercion of others." He quotes Pope Leo XIII in 1891 who wrote that the "fundamental principle of socialism, which would make all posses-

sions public property, is to be utterly rejected because it injures the very ones whom it seeks to help."

Brian Doherty, in the November 4 Journal of Commerce wrote that "if the anti-sprawl agenda became a truly powerful political force, we would have to obey the dictates of busybody politicians who think it better for us to live in a crowded, central city walk-up than to have our own house with a two-car garage and a nice quarter-acre lawn."

We should remember that private property is good for the environment because people always take better care of their own property than they do of property in public ownership. We should realize, too, that if we really want to stop urban sprawl, we must stop this stealth-like abolition of private property so even more people are not forced into central cities and overcrowded suburbs.

Mr. Speaker, we should stop government takeover of property and people will then have both the freedom and the opportunity to spread out.

#### MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the newspapers across the country trumpeted a headline. Here is one from the Washington Post, similar to newspapers all across the country: HMO to Leave Care Decisions Up to Doctors. The subheading is United Health Care has 14.5 Million Clients.

The first three paragraphs read:

"United Health Care, one of the Nation's largest managed care companies, said yesterday that it will stop overruling doctors' decisions about what care patients should receive. The company, which covers 14.5 million people nationwide and more than 200,000 people in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia, is abandoning a cornerstone of the managed care industry's cost containment strategy and one of the features most responsible for the outpouring of public ill will toward managed care. United says it is taking the final say out of the hands of managed care bureaucrats and returning it to the treating physician because requiring doctors to get prior authorization was costing more money than it saved."

Now, think about this. This is the Nation's second largest HMO, in the first place admitting, yes, we have been making medical decisions. And then in the second place saying, but you know what, we have found that that is not cost efficient. So we are going to allow the doctors to make the decisions.

Remember, the HMOs have said during the debate we had here a couple of weeks ago, "Oh, no, we don't make medical decisions, we just make determinations of benefits." And then they